

REMARKS

The Examiner entered a restriction requirement, grouping claims 1-3, 15-17, and 20-48 in Group I, and claims 8-10 and 49-101 in Group II. The alleged basis of the restriction requirement is that Group I is “drawn to *navigating* an information hierarchy and a collection of nodes,” while Group II is “drawn to an *interface* for selecting a node and generating a context lists of contexts.” *See* Office Action at 2. The Examiner goes on to state that what are termed “Inventions I and II” “are unrelated.” *Id.* The Examiner’s sole argument that Groups I and II include independent inventions is that “the different inventions require different modes of operation. Group I requires navigation, while Group II requires an interface.” *Id.* (also citing MPEP §§ 802.01 and 806.06)

Applicant **traverses** this restriction. Applicant notes that claim 1, alleged as being in Group I, recites “an interface of a computer system.” Similarly, claims 8 and 75, alleged as being in Group II, also each recite “an interface.” The accuracy of the Examiner’s statement “Group I requires navigation, while Group II requires an interface” is thus in question. **Both Groups include claims that recite “an interface”** Accordingly, the alleged “navigation” vs. “interface” distinction put forward by the Examiner is, in Applicant’s opinion, without merit. Since this rationale is the only purported basis for the restriction, Applicant submits that the restriction is improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicant’s statements are merely intended to point Applicant’s belief that the Examiner has not properly satisfied the requirements for entering the present restriction requirement. These statements are not intended to constitute any type of statement or admission as to the respective patentability of any of the pending claims vis-à-vis one another.

CONCLUSION

The present response is believed to be a complete response to the issues raised in the office action. If the Examiner has any questions, comments or suggestions, the undersigned earnestly requests a telephone conference.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/6057-06901/DMM.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 18, 2007

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel PC
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
(512) 853-8847